

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14-17 are pending in this application. Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 14.

This Amendment is filed to traverse the rejection of claims 7, 11 and 14 in the February 8, 2006 Office Action. This traversal was not included in the May 5, 2006 Amendment.

In particular, claims 15-17 are added to incorporate the subject matter of claims 7, 11 and 14, respectively, into the pre-May 5, 2006 Amendment version of claims 1, 5, and 9, respectively. Thus, claims 15-17 corresponds to claims 1, 5 and 9 as they stood before they were amended by the May 5, 2006 Amendment, incorporating the subject matter of claims 7, 11 and 14, respectively. Claims 15-17 also recite additional features disclosed in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0026].

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The February 8, 2006 Office Action rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,679,613 to Mabuchi further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,150 to Watanabe et al. ("Watanabe"); rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of Mabuchi, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0073627 to Akiyama and U.S. Patent No. 6,529,250 to Murakami et al. ("Murakami") further in view of Watanabe; and rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over AAPA in view of Mabuchi, Akiyama, Murakami and U.S. Patent No. 6,443,585 to Saccomanno, further in view of Watanabe. These rejections are respectfully traversed to the extent applicable to claims 15-17.

The February 8, 2006 Office Action recognizes that AAPA and Mabuchi do not disclose or suggest the features recited in claims 7, 11 and 14, but assert that Watanabe supplies the subject matter lacking in AAPA and Mabuchi. However, Watanabe does not

disclose or suggest "wherein the reflector plate has an area facing the light conductive plate and only partially formed at an end area close to a boundary formed between the second liquid crystal display element and the reflector plate, so that the reflectance of the reflector plate gradually decreases according to a distance from the second liquid crystal display element in the area, and wherein the area partially formed on the reflector plate is provided without overlapping any parts of the second liquid crystal display element relative to a back surface of the light conductive plate," as recited in claims 15-17. Therefore, Watanabe does not supply the subject matter lacking in AAPA and Mabuchi.

First, Watanabe does not disclose or suggest a reflector plate in addition to a light conductive plate, as recited in claims 7, 11 and 14. The Office Action rejects claim 7, asserting that Watanabe discloses, at col. 8, lines 21-39 and col. 9, lines 11-17, a reflection means 4h having a reflectance gradually varying at a given area close to a liquid crystal display element 2. However, the asserted "reflection means" is an uneven portion of a substrate 4a. See Fig. 6 and col. 8, lines 21-39. The substrate 4a of Watanabe corresponds to the "light conductive plate" of claim 1. Watanabe's uneven portion 4h is not a separate "reflector plate." In particular, Watanabe's substrate 4a does not have a portion that faces a separate "light conductive plate."

Secondly, Watanabe does not disclose or suggest a reflector plate that has an area which is only partially formed at an end area close to a boundary formed between a second liquid crystal display element and the reflector plate so that the reflectance of the reflector plate gradually decreases according to a distance from the second liquid crystal display element in the area, as recited in claims 15-17. In particular, Watanabe discloses portions 4g, 4h and 4d. However, the portions 4g, 4h and 4d are evenly provided on the bottom surface of the lower electrode portion 4b. Thus, Watanabe does not disclose or suggest an area formed on a reflector plate, which contributes to the gradual decrease of the reflectance, that is only

partially provided at the end area close to the boundary formed between the second liquid crystal display element and the reflector plate.

Finally, Watanabe does not disclose or suggest "wherein the area partially formed on the reflector plate is provided without overlapping any parts of the second liquid crystal display element relative to a back surface of the light conductive plate," as recited in claims 15-17.

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), to the extent applicable, is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo  
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/axl

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal  
Request for Continued Examination

Date: October 6, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--